



CITY OF MILPITAS

455 EAST CALAVERAS BOULEVARD, MILPITAS, CALIFORNIA 95035-5479 • www.ci.milpitas.ca.gov

11

May 6, 2003

DRAFT

Mayor and City Council

City of _____

Address

City, CA

Dear Mayor ____ and ____ City Council,

The Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is currently faced with critical decisions that will significantly impact the quality of life in every community throughout the County and the economic vitality of the Silicon Valley region. Each and every one of the residents and businesses located in your jurisdiction will experience the impacts of increased fees, reduced services and a slow down in completing transportation construction projects.

Due to the organizational structure of the VTA Board, these critical decisions are being made without the direct participation of all member jurisdictions. Currently, there are nine cities that do not have a voting seat on the Board of Directors. Though Milpitas appreciates the work of other jurisdictions who represent us on the Board, it does place an unequal burden of responsibility on those who may not be familiar with our jurisdiction's concerns and issues.

As indicated in the attached City Council Resolution, the City of Milpitas requests that a formal public discussion of the VTA Board structure be initiated by our fellow Santa Clara County jurisdictions. Further, we have developed a proposal to restructure the Board that not only provides a voting seat for all jurisdictions, but also would maintain the same proportional vote representation for the City of San Jose and Santa Clara County. Included is a fact sheet that explains our proposal in greater depth.

Restructuring the VTA Board of Directors to provide direct representation for all jurisdictions in Santa Clara County would ensure that everyone has the opportunity to participate in the critical decisions affecting our communities and would provide broader and deeper support and ownership for VTA Board actions on service levels, revenue sources, legislative initiatives and transportation

construction projects. In addition, since its inception in 1995, the VTA organization has matured and developed a reputation for high quality transportation planning, services and project construction and direct VTA Board representation will allow all jurisdictions to participate in VTA's many successes.

We strongly urge your City Council to actively support public discussions and actions to restructure the VTA Board and provide all members permanent voting seats. If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact Vice Mayor Trish Dixon who serves as Milpitas' non-voting Alternate to the VTA Board and a non-voting stakeholder representative to the VTA Board's Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee. She can be reached at (408) 262-6937 or pdixon@ci.milpitas.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Jose Esteves
Mayor

Cc: VTA General Manager

RESOLUTION NO.

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILPITAS
SUPPORTING THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY
VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) was created in 1995 by the California State Legislature by adoption of the Santa Clara County Transit District Act; and

WHEREAS, the VTA is authorized to develop, operate and maintain the County's bus and light rail system and to reduce congestion and improve air quality through a combination of highway and transit capital improvements, lessened demand on the transportation system and improved land use planning; and

WHEREAS, Article 1 of Chapter 4 of the Santa Clara County Transit District Act; created the VTA Board of Directors as a 12 member body representing Santa Clara County, the city of San Jose and the remaining cities located in Santa Clara County; and

WHEREAS, for purposes of Board representation, the non-San Jose cities are organized into the following groupings and Board membership:

3 members	Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Santa Clara and Sunnyvale
1 member	Campbell, Cupertino, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno and Saratoga
1 member	Milpitas, Gilroy and Morgan Hill; and

WHEREAS, at any one time more than half of the non-San Jose cities have a representative from another jurisdiction representing their concerns on the VTA Board; and

WHEREAS, the VTA is responding to critical financial issues and major transportation construction projects that affect the services, costs, and traffic congestion experienced by residents from all local jurisdictions throughout Santa Clara County; and

WHEREAS, VTA Board actions affecting service levels, revenue sources, legislative initiatives, and transportation construction projects will have broader and deeper county support and ownership by the direct participation of all local jurisdictions in the decision-making processes; and

WHEREAS, since its inception, the VTA organization has matured and developed a reputation for high quality transportation planning, services and project construction and direct VTA Board representation will allow all jurisdictions to participate in VTA's many successes; and

WHEREAS, direct VTA Board representation for all Santa Clara County jurisdictions will allow individual cities to more actively participate in VTA actions and proactively respond to the changes within that city; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MILPITAS, CALIFORNIA to submit a proposal that the VTA Board have 21 voting members with five seats for the city of San Jose and two seats for Santa Clara County and the remaining seats distributed equally to the non-San Jose cities to provide direct VTA Board representation for all jurisdictions. Additionally, the proposal would maintain the existing proportional vote representation for the city of San Jose and Santa Clara County by according their individual votes a weight of "three"; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, to encourage our fellow Santa Clara County jurisdictions to begin a public discussion on restructuring the VTA Board for the purpose of providing direct representation on the Board for all Santa Clara County jurisdictions.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 6th day of May 2003, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

Gail Blalock, City Clerk

Jose S. Esteves, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Steven T. Mattas, City Attorney

Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors Organizational Structure

FACT SHEET

Proposal

- Provide one seated VTA Board member per city (except San Jose).
- VTA Board would have 21 voting members. There would be no Alternates.
- Maintains same number of Board seats for city of San Jose and Santa Clara County (5 and 2 respectively).
- Retains existing proportional vote representation for the city of San Jose and Santa Clara County with weighted voting. Each San Jose and Santa Clara County Director's vote would be given a weight of "3".
- Requires amendment to State law and VTA Board approval.

Supporting Concepts

- This is a positive proposal. It provides direct representation for all jurisdictions.
- Direct representation will increase regional cooperation, allow individual cities to more actively participate in VTA actions and more proactively respond to the changes within that city.
- The proposal allows for greater ownership and support countywide as VTA moves forward with major regional projects such as BART.
- The amount of funds available for transportation, particularly with the passage of Measure B, has dramatically increased the importance and decision-making role of this highly visible and public Board.
- The proposal reflects VTA's growth and maturity as an organization. It will allow all jurisdictions to participate in VTA's many successes and the validation of those successes by the voters through the overwhelming victory of Measure A.
- Larger governing boards effectively operate throughout the State through the use of subcommittees.
- Subcommittee work can be more effective because they can focus on the issues.
- Weighted voting will not dilute existing voting relationships and value.
- A larger board will make it easier to maintain continuity and will invest more authority in the Board of Directors rather than VTA staff.

Weighted voting detail on next page

Weighted Vote Calculation

Current				Proposal		
	No. Directors	No. Votes	% of Total Votes	No. Directors	Weighted Votes	% of Total Votes
San Jose	5	5	0.42	5	15	0.43
S.C. County	2	2	0.17	2	6	0.17
Other Cities	5	5	0.42	14	14	0.40
Total	12	12	1.00	21	35	1.00

GOVERNING BOARD CONFIGURATIONS FOR PUBLIC AGENCIES

Agency	Member Jurisdictions	No. Board Members	Members	Voting Procedures
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	1 County 14 Cities 1.3 million population	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 County Supervisor • 14 Cities • 1 AC Transit • 1 BART 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighted voting on all actions • Vote allocation based on population
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County	1 County 20 Cities 720,100 population	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 County Supervisor • 20 City Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighted voting by Director request & final adoption of countywide plans • Successful motions under weighted voting must have a majority of voting members representing majority of County population
MTA (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority)	1 County 88 Cities 9 million population	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 County Supervisors • The Mayor of LA • 3 appointees by L.A. Mayor • 4 appointees from city selection committee • 1 ex-officio appointed by governor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes are not weighted

Continued on next page

City of Milpitas
Governing Board Configurations

MTC (Metropolitan Transportation Commission)	9 Counties 100 Cities 6.9 million population	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 voting members • 2 per five largest counties (one by cities & one by county) • 1 per four smallest counties (nominated by cities & selected by county) • 2 Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) • 2 Bay Conservation & Development Commission • Nonvoting members represent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State Business, Transportation & Housing Agency - Federal Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes are not weighted
MTD (Metropolitan Water District of Southern Calif)	14 Cities 11 Water Districts 1 Water Authority 17 million population	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directors & votes allocated based on assessed valuation.¹ • 4 City of LA • 4 Orange County Municipal Water District • 4 San Diego Water Authority • 13 Other Cities • 12 Other Water Districts • No alternates • Directors not required to be elected officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighted vote distribution based on one vote for each \$10 million assessed valuation • Agencies with multiple Directors share votes.² • Currently total 106 votes on Board.

Continued on next page

¹ Per State law, Metropolitan Water District Act of 1925.

² Example: City of LA has 4 Directors and 21 votes. If 3 Directors are absent, the one present Director exercises all 21 votes.

City of Milpitas
Governing Board Configurations

Sacramento Area Council of Governments	6 County 18 Cities 1.5 million population	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 County Supervisors (3 for Sacramento County) • 2 Sacramento City Council • 9 Other City Council³ • 1 ex-officio representing CalTrans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighted voting by Director request but has never been used • Sacramento County representatives share at least 6 weighted votes.⁴ • Sacramento City representatives share at least 4 weighted votes.⁵ • Other County representatives receive 1 vote/100,000 population. • Board may vote on transportation and air quality issues by geographic subareas.
San Diego Association of Governments	1 County 18 Cities 2.8 million population	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 County Supervisor • 1 from each of the 17 non-San Diego cities (with 1 or 2 alternates) • 9 nonvoting advisory representatives (US Dept. of Defense, Caltrans, Metro. Transportation District, etc.) • 2 San Diego City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weighted voting set annually by jurisdiction population • San Diego city votes have 40% weight, County is 16%, Chula Vista 7%, etc. • Policy matters must be approved by both a board majority and a weighted majority.

³ Per County, 1 Director /100,000 population

⁴ More votes added when population exceeds 700,000.

⁵ More votes added when population exceeds 500,000.

Santa Clara County VTA Board of Directors Organizational Structure

Milpitas Supporting Concepts

- Milpitas is an active contributing participant in regional projects, such as the 880/Dixon Landing and 880/237 interchange improvements, I-680 HOV Lanes, the 680/880 Cross Connector corridor study, the Tasman East/Capital Light Rail project and the BART extension. With so many major projects affecting our jurisdiction we should have an active role at Board meetings where decisions are made on these projects.
- The Milpitas community strongly supports transportation initiatives. In November 2000, 75.6% of Milpitas voters supported the Measure A sales tax extension.
- Milpitas has contributed more financially per capita for VTA projects than any other Santa Clara County jurisdiction and should have direct representation in the decision-making process. (\$806/resident or \$3,030/household spent on regional transportation improvements between 1990 and 2000).
- The current organization results in Milpitas being directly represented on the VTA Board only 2 years out of 6 as follows:

2003	Alternate
2004	Member
2005	Member
2006	None
2007	None
2008	Alternate
2009	Alternate
2010	Member
2011	Member